



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,746	02/28/2002	Travis J. Parry	10012900-1	8769
7590	03/15/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			LASHLEY, LAUREL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/086,746	PARRY, TRAVIS J.
	Examiner Laurel Lashley	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to amendments received 12/27/2005. Applicant's amendments/arguments with respect to previously presented claims 1 – 7, 12, 18 – 19 and 21 – 23, amended claims 8, 11, 13 – 17 and 20 have been fully considered (MPEP 714.04; 37 CFR 1.111) but are not persuasive. The Examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (See MPEP 706.07a).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to Applicant's argument in relation to claim 1 that Docter does not teach "a filter program associated with said processor so as to control printing of a file", Examiner respectfully disagrees. Docter does describe a system capable of filtering data for a particular user (see column 3, lines 1 – 3) and further states that the teachings of the invention can be applied to "any device containing a processor or a controller capable of executing instructions" (see column 3, lines 20 – 22). Furthermore, Docter teaches that through the functionality of a system bus, various components are coupled and through any processing device (i.e. printer), implementation of the steps necessary to perform data filtering operations can be achieved (see column 9, lines 51 – 56 and Figure 11). According to these assertions, Examiner believes a printer, when coupled with the data filtering system (by way of a processor) is capable of controlling printing of a file. The data of Docter is actually profile data (see Figure 4), which is

subject to the filtering criteria (see Figure 8a, b and c) and contains data elements of data recipients or roles (see Abstract, lines 13 – 15).

For claim 2, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument that Docter does not describe a filtering program stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware of printer associated with a processor. Examiner believes disk drive, random access and read only memories and a printer are depicted by Docter as being coupled to a processor (also having storage capability) that performs data filtering operations (see Figure 10 and column 9, lines 43 – column 10, lines 1 – 9 and 14 - 17).

For claims 6, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 15, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments that Docter does not teach the filtering program interacting with the processor whereby yielding results based on undesirable characteristics, desirable characteristics and lacking an undesirable characteristic and has a desirable characteristic. Examiner equates the first filter criteria of Docter to be equivalent to an undesired characteristic and the second filter criteria of Docter to be equivalent to desired characteristic (see column 10, lines 32 – 48). Since the invention of Docter describes a system capable of filtering data for a particular user (see column 3, lines 1 – 3) and further states that the teachings of the invention can be applied to "any device containing a processor or a controller capable of executing instructions" (see column 3, lines 20 – 22), the Examiner interprets this to mean that the processor can cause or prevent printing based on the specified criteria.

For claims 9, 10, 16 and 17, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments that Docter does not teach the components of the undesirable and desirable

characteristics. Examiner believes that Docter teaches that the first and second criteria are defined by distinct attributes as in Applicant's case with the undesirable and desirable characteristics (see column 8, lines 40 – 52 and column 10, lines 52 – 54 and 34 – 42).

As for Applicant's arguments in regards to claims 11 and 20 that Docter does not describe "a printing packet" and "a packet including at least one file to be printed" respectively, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Docter asserts a system capable of filtering data for a particular user (see column 3, lines 1 – 3) and further states that the teachings of the invention can be applied to "any device containing a processor or a controller capable of executing instructions" (see column 3, lines 20 – 22). Furthermore, Docter teaches that through the functionality of a system bus, various components are coupled and through any processing device (i.e. printer), implementation of the steps necessary to perform data filtering operations can be achieved (see column 9, lines 51 – 56 and Figure 11). The data of Docter is actually profile data (see Figure 4), which is subject to the filtering criteria (see Figure 8a, b and c) and contains data elements of data recipients or roles (see Abstract, lines 13 – 15). Therefore the Examiner believes that it is inherent that data received by a device is of that device-type meaning that a printer, will receive/process instructions that are printer-type (i.e. printing packet and packet including a file to be printed). Kenworthy in US Patent No. 6317837 substantiates this assertion where the network attached devices (specifically a printer) are depicted as being subjected to device specific firewalls (see Figure 1 and column 3, lines 8 – 11 and 20 – 31). In Kenworthy, devices are protected from all traffic/access

foreign to it; therefore it is inherent that a printer would only receive printing traffic (i.e. printing packet and packet including a file to be printed).

For reasons indicated above, rejections made to dependent claims not specifically addressed are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Docter et al. in US Patent 6,330,610 B1 (hereinafter '610).

As it relates to claim 1, US '610 teaches:

A printing system, comprising:

a printer including: (see Figure 10, and column 10, line 7: where it is inherent that printing can be preformed)

a processor; and (see column 9, line 52)
a printing component in communication with said processor (see column 9, line 56); and
a filtering program associated with said processor so as to control printing of a file by said printing component based on at least one of a presence or absence of at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said file (see Figure 11; column 1, line 66: a system for filtering data; column 10, line 10 – column 11, lines 1 – 7).

For claim 2, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 1, wherein said filtering program is stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware of said printer associated with said processor (see Figure 10 and column 9, lines 51 – 65).

For claim 3, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 1, wherein said filtering program is stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware external to said printer and in communication with said processor (see Figure 10 and column 9, lines 51 – 65).

For claim 4, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 3, further comprising:

a computer including said at least one of said memory device and said firmware, a processor in communication with said at least one of said memory device and said firmware, and a communication port for at least partially establishing communication between said processor of said computer and

said processor of said printer (see Figure 10 and column 9, lines 51 – 65 and column 10, lines 1 – 9).

For claim 5, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 1, wherein said at least one prespecified characteristic comprises at least one of an undesirable characteristic (see column 2, line 2: first filter criteria) and a desirable characteristic (see column 2, line 5: second filter criteria).

For claim 6, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 5, wherein said filtering program causes said processor to prevent said printing component from printing a file of a packet having at least one said undesirable characteristic (see column 10, lines 32 – 33: where filtering is based on data received; and column 2, lines 14 – 15: where the profile data set contains elements associated with particular class of recipients).

For claim 7, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 5, wherein said filtering program instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print a file of a packet having said desirable characteristic (see column 10, line 62: where filter data processing code determines the destination of packet).

For claim 8, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 5, wherein said filtering program instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print said file only if said packet lacks said undesirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic (column 3, line 17: where unwanted data is eliminated).

For claim 9, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 5, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command (column 2, line 2; and column 3, lines 34 – 40: where it is inherent that criteria can be designated within specified criteria).

For claim 10, US '610 teaches:

The printing system of claim 5, wherein said desirable characteristic comprises one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password (column 2, line 5; and column 3, lines 34 – 40).

As it pertains to claim 11, US '610 teaches:

A device-specific filtering method, comprising:

transmitting a printing packet comprising at least one file from a source computer, across a network, to a device of said network (see column 10, line 66: where instances can be altered to Applicant's invention) ;

evaluating at least one prespecified characteristic of said printing packet following passage of said printing packet through a server of said network (see column 10, line 32: where evaluation is performed by the data filter code which determines packet content based on coding); and

controlling at least one of further transmission of said printing packet to said device and processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said device based on said evaluating (see column 10, line 62: where controlling is performed by the filter data processing code which determines the destination of packet).

For claim 12, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 11, wherein said evaluating at least one prespecified characteristic comprises evaluating at least one of an undesirable characteristic and a desirable characteristic (see column 10, line 32).

For claim 13, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 12, wherein said controlling comprises preventing said at least one of further transmission of said printing packet to said device and processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said device if said printing packet has at least one said undesirable characteristic (see column 3, line 17 and column 10, line 62).

For claim 14, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 12, wherein said controlling comprises permitting said at least one of further transmission of said printing packet to said device and processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said device if said printing packet has said desirable characteristic (see column 3, line 17 and column 10, line 62).

For claim 15, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 12, wherein said controlling comprises permitting said at least one of further transmission of said printing packet to said device and processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said device if said printing packet lacks said undesirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic (see column 3, line 17 and column 10, line 62).

For claim 16, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 12, wherein said evaluating comprises evaluating said printing packet for at least one said undesirable characteristic comprising at least one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command (see column 10, line 32 and column 2, line 2).

For claim 17, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 12, wherein said evaluating comprises evaluating said printing packet for at least one said desirable characteristic comprising at least one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password (see column 10, line 32 and column 2, line 5).

For claim 18, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 11, wherein said evaluating is effected by a processor of said device (see Figure 10 and column 9, line 52).

For claim 19, US '610 teaches:

The device-specific filtering method of claim 11, wherein said evaluating is effected by a processor external to and in communication with a processor of said device (see Figure 10 and column 9, lines 56 - 58).

As it relates to claim 20, US '610 teaches:

A system for filtering a file transmitted to a destination device, comprising:

a processor in communication with a network across which the file has been transmitted; and (see Figure 10 and column 3, lines 26 – 29)

a filtering program associated with said processor so as to control at least one of transmission of a packet including at least one file to be printed to the destination device and processing of said at least one file to be printed by the destination device based on at least one of a presence or absence of at least one prespecified characteristic from said packet including said at least one file to be printed (see Figure 11; column 1, line 66; and column 10, line 10 – column 11, lines 1 – 7).

For claim 21, US '610 teaches:

The system of claim 20, wherein said filtering program is stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware (see Figure 10 – 11 and column 9, line 59: ROM; and column 10, line 23: interface code).

For claim 22, US '610 teaches:

The system of claim 21, wherein said processor and said memory device or said firmware are parts of the destination device (see Figure 10 and column 10, lines 7 – 9: where a printer can be destination device).

For claim 23, US '610 teaches:

The system of claim 21, wherein said processor and said memory device or said firmware are parts of a computer in communication with the destination device (see Figure 10 and column 9, line 51 – column 10, lines 1 – 9).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kenworthy in US Patent No. 6317837 discloses network-attached devices that are subject to device specific firewalls.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurel Lashley whose telephone number is 571-272-0693. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, alt Fridays btw 7:30 am & 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Laurel Lashley
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

 LLL
08 March 2006


GILBERTO BARRON, SR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100